

Fiscal Note 2017 Biennium

Bill #	HB0620		Title: Establish	ning all-payer claims d	latabase	
Primary Sponsor:	Redfield, Alan		Status: As Introd	duced		
☐Significant Local Gov Impact		✓ Needs to be included in HB 2 ✓ Technical Concerns				
☐Included in the Executive Budget		☐ Significant Long-Term Impacts ☐ Dedicated Revenue Form Attached		Attached		
		FISCAL S	UMMARY			
		FY 2016 Difference	FY 2017 Difference	FY 2018 Difference	FY 2019 Difference	
Expenditures:						
General Fund		\$1,024,500	\$74,500	\$275,618	\$279,752	
Revenue:						
General Fund		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Net Impact-Gener	ral Fund Balance:	(\$1,024,500)	(\$74.500)	(\$275,618)	(\$279.752)	

<u>Description of fiscal impact:</u> HB 620 establishes the Montana All-Payer Claims Database (APCD), to collect and analyze health care services information, and provide health care pricing and quality transparency. The database would be developed and maintained by the State Auditor's Office, with applicable claims data being submitted by the various health plans.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Assumptions:

State Auditor's Office (SAO)

- 1. The bill requires the SAO to establish criteria and contract with a vendor; promote the information contained in the database; publish reports and raise awareness; and consult with interested parties.
- 2. One FTE Administrative Specialist band 6 will be needed at an annual cost of \$74,500 for salary and benefits.
- 3. The bill requires the SAO to establish and oversee the development and continued use and maintenance of the database.

- 4. The SAO will contract with a third-party vendor to create the database at a cost of \$950,000 over the biennium, requested as a biennial appropriation in FY 2016 and continuing into FY 2017, and annual maintenance of \$200,000 in FY 2018 and beyond.
- 5. There is a 1.5% inflationary factor applied to FY 2018 and FY 2019 personal services and operating costs.

Department of Administration (DOA)

6. The State of Montana Employee Group Benefits Plan (plan) utilizes the services of a third party administrator (TPA) to process and pay claims. The plan is self—insured. As part of the contract, the TPA is required to submit claims data to the plan's data warehouse. The additional charge by the plan's current TPA would be \$750 per data feed. If the claims data feed were to be submitted on a monthly basis, there would be a cost of \$9,000 (\$750 X 12).

	FY 2016 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2017 Difference	FY 2018 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2019 <u>Difference</u>			
Fiscal Impact:							
FTE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Expenditures:							
Personal Services	\$74,500	\$74,500	\$75,618	\$76,752			
Operating Expenses	\$959,000	\$9,000	\$209,000	\$212,000			
TOTAL Expenditures	\$1,033,500	\$83,500	\$284,618	\$288,752			
Funding of Expenditures: General Fund (01) Other TOTAL Funding of Exp.	\$1,024,500 \$9,000 \$1,033,500	\$74,500 \$9,000 \$83,500	\$275,618 \$9,000 \$284,618	\$279,752 \$9,000 \$288,752			
Revenues:							
General Fund (01)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
TOTAL Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures):							
General Fund (01) Other	(\$1,024,500) (\$9,000)	(\$74,500) (\$9,000)	(\$275,618) (\$9,000)	(\$279,752) (\$9,000)			
Outer	(ΨΣ,000)	(Ψ2,000)	(ψ2,000)	(42,000)			

Technical Notes:

State Auditor's Office (SAO)

- 1. This would apply to current health service corporations and any other health service corporation that might be formed in the future, and should be included in the applicability provision of 33-30-102(1), MCA, similar to what is proposed for 33-31-111 and 33-35-306.
- 2. HB 620 allows for "user fees" to be assessed, but the amount of fees that could be generated are unknown at this time. Also, there will be no possibility of user fees until the database has been built and data has been collected a process that could take more than a year. In the future, the APCD may become wholly or partially self-supporting, but is difficult to assess when that will occur.

Fiscal Note Request – As Introduced					
Department of Administration (DOA) 3. Section 5 of HB 620 outlines how a plan or third-party administrator that fails to comply verification requirements of the bill is subject to a fine of up to \$5,000 per violation. The definition of a violation defined in this bill. Specifically, it is unclear if a violation would be considered once for the entity year, for each time a data feed was not provided as outlined in the rules (for example monthly or que or some other criteria.					

Sponsor's Initials

Date

Budget Director's Initials

Date